FICHE NUMBER

144775

NOT AVAILABLE FROM EDRS

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 774 RC 010 139

AUTHOR Voss, Paul R.; Fuguitt, Glenn V.
TITLE Migrant Characteristics of a "Turnaround" Area: 1965-70 Immigration to a 45-County Subarea of the Upper Great Lakes.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (Madison, Wisconsin, September 2-4, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Age Differences; Caucasians; Census Figures; Comparative Analysis; *Migrants; Place of Residence; *Residential Patterns; Rural Nonfarm Residents; Rural Population; Rural Urban Differences; *Sex Differences; Urban Population; *Urban to Rural Migration
IDENTIFIERS *Nonmigrants; *Upper Great Lakes Region

ABSTRACT

Utilizing 1970 census data on a 45-county area in the northern Upper Great Lakes Region, the following questions were addressed: (1) In what ways do recent migrants to this nonmetropolitan region differ from those "nonmigrants" who resided in the region in both 1965 and 1970? (2) To what extent do the recent migrants from metropolitan counties differ from migrants from other nonmetropolitan counties? (3) Does the origin of migrants influence the character of their location in 1970? The populations represented were 985,000 residents of the region in 1970 who were 5 years or older and had reported U.S. residence in 1965 and a sub-population of 322,000 white heads of households in 1970. Migrants and non-migrants were compared in terms of sex differences, location of residence (urban, rural, rural nonfarm, and group quarters), age differences, and selected characteristics of white household heads. Results indicated that: inmigrants were considerably younger than the non-migrant residents (due to a higher propensity to migrate among the young in general and due to substantial outmigration among the young of this region); the majority of inmigrants had metropolitan origins and urban destinations, although they were attracted disproportionately to rural nonfarm locations (especially the older migrants seeking retirement); a substantial proportion of the inmigrants were enumerated in group quarters in 1970, having changed residence to attend an academic institution. (JC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED144774

OCT 1977
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

MIGRANT CHARACTERISTICS OF A "TURNAROUND" AREA: 1965-70 IMMIGRATION TO A 45-COUNTY SUBAREA OF THE UPPER GREAT LAKES

Paul R. Voss and Glenn V. Fuguitt
Department of Rural Sociology
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, September 2-4, 1977, Madison, Wisconsin.

We acknowledge with appreciation the help of Barbara Witt, for programming assistance; Daniel McLain and Michael Shalev for tabulating the data; and Marianne Dryer and Donna Cross, for typing the manuscript. The research was supported by the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, University of Wisconsin-Madison and by the Department of Administration, State of Wisconsin. Analysis was done on the computer of the Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin, provided through a grant from the Center for Population Research of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Spring, 1977

RC010139

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Paul R. Voss

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

MIGRANT CHARACTERISTICS OF A "TURNAROUND" AREA: 1965-70 IMMIGRATION TO A 45-COUNTY SUBAREA OF THE UPPER GREAT LAKES

INTRODUCTION

A general outline of the recent and rather widely-heralded "turnaround" of the dominant migration stream between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas in the United States has by now been drawn (see, for example, Beale and Fuguitt, 1975; Tucker, 1976; Morrison and Wheeler, 1976). Evidence of a cessation of nonmetropolitan population decline was available for some parts of the country a full decade ago, but it was only after the Census Bureau's post-1970 county population estimates were published and examined that the pervasive extent of the new migration pattern was fully appreciated. Detailed analyses of this phenomenon are now beginning to appear, and there may well be on the horizon a "turnaround" in the dominant emphasis in the migration literature as well.

Calvin Beale (1975) has implicated a number of factors in the revival of population growth in nonmetropolitan areas. Among these are the growth-inducing effects of new state educational institutions placed away from metropolitan centers; the decentralization of manufacturing (see also Kirchenbaum, 1971); the development and exploitation, in environmentally attractive rural areas, of recreational and retirement facilities; super-suburbanization resulting, in part, from continued metropolitan decentralization (see also Gustafson, 1975); a growing public preference (and the ability of people to act on this preference) for residential locations in small towns and rural areas (see also Fuguitt and Zuiches, 1975); and higher birth rates in nonmetropolitan areas. While all of these factors emerge as important considerations in a national overview of the net migration reversal, there are substantial regional differences in the underlying mechanisms producing the new pattern as well as significant

regional differences in the response to these mechanisms (Kirchenbaum, 1971). An appropriate second step in the explication of the turnaround phenomenon will be to delineate the particular character of the new pattern for different regions of the country. Beale began this work as part of his national overview and has continued it in a companion paper with Fuguitt (Beale and Fuguitt, 1975). At least one recent study develops more fully the character of population growth in a specific subnational region (De Jong and Humphrey, 1976). The investigation summarized in the present paper examines some of the characteristics of the migrants, between 1965 and 1970, to a group of 45 nonmetropolitan counties in northern Minnesota, Wisconsin and Upper Peninsular Michigan. The following questions are addressed: (1) In what ways do recent migrants to this nonmetropolitan region differ from those "nonmigrants" who resided in the region in both 1965 and 1970? (2) To what extent do the recent migrants from metropolitan counties differ from migrants from other nonmetropolitan counties? and (3) Does the origin of migrants influence the character of their location in 1970?

DATA

Our data are taken from the 1970 Census of Population one percent Public Use Sample Tapes and pertain specifically to three Census-defined County Groups in the northern Upper Great Lakes Region. The counties included in the analysis, listed in Appendix Table A-1 and illustrated in Figure A-1, had a 1970 population of just over one million persons. They are, for the most part, poor and economically depressed counties. Once part of a booming economy, based first on the exploitation of the northern region's vast timber stands and, following this, similar exploitation of rich mineral deposits, the region's economic base was gradually eroded away during the first quarter of this century.

Efficiency in the continued exploitation of diminishing resources reduced labor needs, and the advantage of nearness to market disappeared for the region's farmers. As Loomis and Wirth point out, "agriculture, handicapped by limited areas of productive soil, a short growing season, and remoteness from markets, could not sustain the level of economic activity that had characterized the booming lumber and minerals industries" (1967:1). Economic adjustments, manifest in demographic changes, followed. Overall, substantial population growth through the first two decades of the twentieth century, were followed by very slow growth in succeeding decades. The area actually declined in population by two percent during the decade 1940 to 1950.

There are, of course, exceptions to this general pattern within the area. Ashland and Iron Counties in Wisconsin and Keweenaw County in Michigan have experienced continuous population decline since 1920, even to the most recent period, while several counties--particularly in North-Central Wisconsin--have experienced continuous population growth since the turn of the century. Nevertheless, in the fifty years spanning 1920 to 1970, these 45 counties increased in population by only ten percent, and even this was sustained only by a sufficiently large excess of births over deaths to counteract substantial population losses due to net outmigration. But recent intercensal periods show a quickening pace in population growth, and post-1970 population estimates for the area indicate that these counties are now actually increasing in population considerably faster (6.9 percent between 1970 and 1975) than the nation as a whole (4.8 percent for the same period). Again, there are exceptions to this pattern, and perhaps the most interesting are the very rapidly growing counties--such as Wisconsin's environmentally-attractive Oneida, Vilas, Sawyer and Washburn Counties, each of which experienced growth rates between 1970 and 1975 exceeding three percent per year.

If the upward trend in growth rates for this region as a whole has been relatively steady in recent years, then Census information covering the 1965-1970 period might well yield some insights regarding current growth in the region. In fact, Beale concludes that the turnaround in this Upper Great Lakes region was evident as early as 1966 (Beale, 1975). If we further accept that the lion's share of recent growth in the area is due to net inmigration rather than to natural increase, then clearly some understanding of recent migrants to the area can be obtained by examining the characteristics of inmigrants to the area ten years ago.

Using census data on place of residence in 1965 in conjunction with location of residence in 1970, we studied the set of migration streams to this 45-county region shown in Table 1. Origin and destination characteristics were determined by combining items from the housing and person records. Migration status was determined from the person record by using the item "place of residence five years ago" in conjunction with the metropolitan/nonmetropolitan (1970 definition) character of the residence five years ago. Residence in 1970 was determined by using the housing item "location of structure" together with the "sales of farm products" item to produce the standard urban, rural nonfarm, rural farm breakdown.

The numbers in Table 1 pertain to sample frequencies from the one-percent Public Use Sample. The population represented is the approximate 985 thousand residents of the region in 1970 who were five years old or over, and reported a U.S. residence in 1965. In some instances, the presentation is further restricted to the 322 thousand individuals who were white heads of households in 1970 (numbers shown in parantheses in Table 1).

Table 1 About Here

NON-MIGRANTS

By far, the largest group examined here represents nonmigrants, those who did not change their county of residence between 1965 and 1970, and it is against this group that we will compare the migrant streams. Nearly 84 percent of the population over five years of age in 1970 lived in the same county five years earlier. A majority of this group lived (in 1970) in urban places or in nearby locations classified as "suburban" by the Census Bureau; twenty-eight percent of non-migrants lived in rural non-farm locations in 1970 and another 15 percent lived on farms. Somewhat fewer than two percent of the non-migrants resided in group quarters.

As shown in Table 2, there are modest differences in this overall pattern between males and females and also between different age groups. Females are, for all but the youngest age group, somewhat more likely than males to be found in urban locations. And persons over 35 years of age, especially the elderly, are also over-represented in urban places, mainly at the expense of farm areas. Younger persons (ages 5 to 19 years) tend to be over-represented on farms. The former age difference probably represents both the departure from farms of some retired persons, as well as an age composition effect which results from the greater outmigration of younger persons from urban places than from farms. Data presented in the top panel of Table 3 indicate the extent to which young adult non-migrants ages 15-19 are under-represented in cities and rural open places relative to those living on farms. The over-representation of children on farms may reflect the somewhat higher fertility in rural farm areas.

Tables 2 and 3 About Here

The earlier departure of young women than of young men from farm residence is evident in both Tables 2 and 3. While more than 18 percent of girls 5 to 14 years old reside on farms, the proportion is reduced to half that figure for women in their twenties. Note also that urban places show an increase in non-migrant women residents for these same age groups. Men, on the other hand, appear to outmigrate from all residence categories in such a way that their residence distribution remains more stable across age groups. Men, on the other hand, appear to outmigrate from all residence categories in such a way that their residence distribution remains more stable across age groups. These findings are consistent with the migration literature demonstrating that young females make generally shorter distance moves than young males and are more attracted to urban areas (e.g., Shryock, 1964).

Table 4 shows how non-migrants compare with migrants on a number of socioeconomic characteristics. These data are presented only for the white head of household subgroup.

Table 4 About Here

MIGRANTS

Sixteen percent of the 1970 residents in this 45-county region resided in a different county in 1965, and most of these migrants (55 percent) moved to this northern non-metropolitan area from metropolitan counties. While this is a lower proportion with metro origins than would be obtained if migrants to the region were drawn randomly from all places outside the region in 1965, it nevertheless signifies a change, for a substantial number of people, from direct access to metropolitan services to dependence on a nonmetropolitan trade and service structure. This lends indirect support to the idea that one component

of the "turnaround" in this region does consist of migrants who have become disenchanged with life in the country's large metropolitan centres. Young people between the ages of 15 and 19 who migrated to the region between 1965 and 1970 were less likely to have metro origins than other migrants; middle-aged migrants (and their children), regardless of their location in 1970, were more likely to have moved from a metropolitan county. There is no particular difference between men and women migrants in terms of their origins beyond the fact that females in city locations seem more likely to have originated in metropolitan counties than males.

Table 5 shows that the probability of being a migrant varies considerably by age, 1970 residence and, to some extent, also by sex. Farm residents are less than half as likely as city and other rural residents to have migrated, whereas persons residing in group quarters--especially males--are more likely to have migrated in the previous five years. For most age groups, males reveal

---

Table 5 About Here

---

a slightly higher propensity to move than do females. Nevertheless, differences by sex are not pronounced, except for persons ages 20-29 in 1970. Among adults in their early twenties, females are more likely to be migrants. Among those in their late twenties, males tend to show the higher probability of inmigration. These opposing patterns by age and sex probably reflect the differences between men and women in the age at which new households are established--an age difference resulting from different average ages at first marriage.

In general, the highest probabilities of migration exist for young adults. These age-specific inmitration rates are computed by dividing the number of

inmigrants between 1965 and 1970 (the volume of inmigration) in an age group in 1970 (second from bottom row in Table 5) by the total number of residents (inmigrants plus non-migrants) in that age group in 1970 (bottom line). The rates follow a rather peaked bell curve--exactly the pattern one would expect on the basis of a substantial literature concerning migration differentials.

However, the volume of in migration varies nowhere nearly as much by age as does the rate structure. The reason for this is that the relatively modest levels of inmigration of young adults to this northern area are offset by very substantial outmigration of young adults from the area. This point is strongly supported by the average age structure for the region shown in the final row of Table 2 and even more by the age distribution of non-migrants shown in the top panel of Table 3.

The small volume of inmigration which does exist among young adults reflects, to a great extent, non-permanent residence. Approximately 35 percent of inmigrants ages 15 to 24 were residing in group quarters in 1970. Most (62 percent) of these group-quartered inmigrants were living in college dormitories. The second most numerous category of group quarters residents was that of older persons in nursing homes ("aged and dependent homes"); however, more than two-thirds of these persons were non-migrants.

Farm locations represent a departure from the expected pattern of age-specific inmigration rates. For males, the probability of inmigration to farms increases steadily from age group 15-19 to age 30-34 for males. To what extent this reflects delayed movement (return) of sons to family farms upon retirement of their fathers, or the delayed acquisition of new farms because of large capital acquisition costs, cannot be sorted out from these figures. It does indicate, however, that the pattern of age-specific migration

rates to farms differs from similar rates to other residence locations in this region of the Upper Great Lakes.

Regardless of origin, migrants to the region, who are white heads of household, have higher socioeconomic status than do the non-migrant residents (Table 4). They are considerably younger than the residents, and report higher levels of completed education, occupational status and income. Migrants are also more likely to be married and living with spouse, more likely to be working, and less likely to be receiving retirement or welfare income. Even though a substantial portion of these differences is explained by the differing age structures between the migrant and non-migrant groups (Table 3), and while these data tell us nothing about the characteristics of the people who left this northern region between 1965 and 1970, the implication clearly is that these counties are benefitting, socioeconomically, by the new pattern of net inmigration.

The metro origin migrants do not substantially differ on the SES dimensions from migrants with nonmetro origins. As might be expected on the basis of national differences, the income of persons who lived in metropolitan places in 1965 is larger than that of persons from nonmetropolitan places. Beyond this dissimilarity, most of the significant differences between metro and nonmetro migrants have to do with their place of residence in 1970.

A slight majority (51 percent) of migrants to this northern region between 1965 and 1970 settled in urban places (Table 1). If persons residing in group quarters in 1970 are excluded, this proportion rises to 59 percent. Interestingly, migrants with metropolitan origins are no more likely than those with nonmetropolitan origins to end up in urban locations. The next most common location of migrants is in villages under 2500 population and in rural open country.

Thirty-five percent (excluding those in group quarters) were located in rural non-farm areas in 1970. The corresponding figure for non-migrants is 28 percent, indicating that recent migrants are considerably over-represented in rural non-farm areas. Moreover, among migrants, those with metropolitan origins are somewhat more likely than those with nonmetropolitan origins to to be living in rural non-farm areas.

Migrants are much less likely than non-migrants to be found on farms in 1970. Of the small number of migrants that did settle on farms, there is a slightly higher likelihood of having had nonmetropolitan as opposed to metropolitan origins.

In general, then, cities tend to attract most of the migrants to this northern region. And Table 4 shows that these migrants tend to be younger and have higher levels of occupational status and education. Higher proportions of unmarried persons are found in cities than elsewhere, and of the recent migrants in cities, fully 13 percent were in school in 1965. Group-quartered residents aside, Table 5 reveals that among residence-age-sex-specific categories, the highest probabilities of inmigration from another county between 1965 and 1970 prevail for males and females, between the ages of 20 and 35, in city and non-farm locations. The rates for city dwellers are uniformly greater than for rural non-farm residents among males in these age groups and are greater among females at these age groups, save for ages 25-29. At all other age groups (i.e., for older adults and their children), the probability of being a migrant is greater in the rural non-farm areas, and over all ages combined, rural non-farm areas show the highest probability of migration. Yet, we emphasize again, almost without exception (the single exception is migrants, aged 62 and over, from metro origins), if we ignore group-quartered individuals, most migrants chose urban locations. This is overwhelmingly true among persons

aged 15-25 but is true as well for most age-sex-origin categories. In only three instances (metro origin males ages 45-64 and 65-plus; and nonmetro origin females ages 35-44) is the percentage of migrants choosing city locations less than an absolute majority--and even among the three exceptions, the figure is close to 50 percent (Table 2).

The rectification of the findings in Tables 2 and 5 involves consideration of the overall residence distribution of persons in the region. Since the non-farm open country has fewer residents than does the combined urban land (28 percent versus 55 percent of the total), the slightly higher propensity for inmigration among rural non-farm residents still produces an overall number of inmigrants significantly lower than the number which migrated to urban locations (roughly 49 thousand versus 81 thousand). That is to say, even though the overall probability of being an inmigrant is greater in rural non-farm areas, roughly 59 percent of all non-group-quartered migrants assumed a destination location in urban places.

CONCLUSIONS

In this brief look at inmigrants to 45 nonmetropolitan counties in the northern Upper Great Lakes Region between 1965 and 1970, we are able to note the operation of some of the factors identified by Beale as being involved in the recent turnaround phenomenon. Inmigrants to the region are considerably younger than the non-migrants residing in the region, partly because the propensity to migrate is higher among young adults anyway, but partly also because of the substantial outmigration from the region of young people.

The majority of migrants to the region between 1965 and 1970 had metropolitan origins and urban destinations, although they were attracted

disproportionately to rural non-farm locations. This is especially true of older migrants from metropolitan areas many of whom appear to be retiring to rural areas in these northern counties.

A substantial proportion of inmigrants were enumerated in group quarters in 1970, many having changed county of residence for purposes of attending the academic institutions in the region.

REFERENCES

Beale, Calvin L, 1975. "The Revival of Population Growth in Nonmetropolitan America." Economic Research Service Publication ERS-605. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Beale, Calvin L. and Glenn V. Fuguitt, 1975. "The New Pattern of Nonmetropolitan Population Change." Working Paper 75-22. Madison: Center for Demography and Ecology.

De Jong, Gordon F. and Craig R. Humphrey, 1976. "Selected Characteristics of Metropolitan-to-Nonmetropolitan Area Migrants: A Study of Population Redistribution in Pennsylvania." Rural Sociolgy, 41 (Winter): 526-538.

Fuguitt, Glenn V. and James J. Zuiches, 1975. "Residential Preferences and Population Distribution." Demography, 12 (August): 491-504.

Gustafson, Neil C., 1975. "Don't Jump to Conclusions About the 'New' Population Trends." Unpublished manuscript.

Kirschenbaum, Alan, 1971. "Patterns of Migration from Metropolitan to Nonmetropolitan Areas." Rural Sociology 36 (September):315-325.

Loomis, R.A. and M.E. Wirth, 1967. "An Economic Survey of the Northern Lake States Region." Economic Research Service Report No. 108. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Morrison, Peter A. and Judith P. Wheeler, 1976. "Rural Renaissance in America? The Revival of Population Growth in Remote Areas." Population Bulletin 31 (October).

Shryock, Henry S., Jr., 1964. Population Mobility Within the United States. Chicago: Community and Family Study Center.

Tucker, Jack C., 1976. "Changing Patterns of Migration Between Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Areas in the United States: Recent Evidence." Demography, 13 (November): 435-443.

Table 1. Migration Status 1965-1970 by Location in 1970[1]

Migration Status 1965-70	Location in 1970[2] City or Suburb	Rural Non-Farm	Rural Farm	Group Quarters	Total	Percent
Non-Migrants	4615 (1675)	2309 (768)	1204 (314)	134 (-)	8262 (2757)	83.9
Migrants	812 (283)	487 (157)	85 (21)	207 (-)	1591 (461)	16.1
Metro Origin	450 (153)	280 (90)	43 (11)	109 (-)	882 (254)	
Nonmetro Origin	362 (130)	207 (67)	42 (10)	98 (-)	709 (207)	
Totals	5427 (1958)	2796 (925)	1289 (335)	341 (-)	9853	100.0
Percent	55.1	18.4	13.1	3.5	100.0	

1. The frequencies given here are one-percent sample frequencies. These should be multiplied by 100 to obtain approximate frequencies for the population. Excluded are children under 5 years of age in 1970, persons who were abroad in 1965, and persons for whom migration status was not reported. Numbers in parentheses refer to white heads of household only.

2. This item is obtained from the housing record. The location of each structure was coded by the Census Bureau into one of four categories: on a city or suburban lot; on a place of less than 10 acres; on a place of 10 or more acres; and N.A. (group quarters). By tabulating this item against the item "sales of farm products" we are able to locate each individual in one of the conventional categories as indicated.

Table 2. Residence Distribution in 1970 of Non-Migrants, Metro Migrants, and Nonmetro Migrants by Age in 1970 and Sex[1]

Migration Status between 1965-70 and 1970 Residence	Males								
	5-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-44	45-64	65+	Total
Non-Migrants	1017	455	205	163	163	455	1051	560	4069
City	53.4%	49.9%	51.2%	52.8%	49.1%	56.3%	54.7%	56.1%	53.7%
RNF	29.4	27.9	27.3	28.8	41.1	27.7	27.8	29.5	29.0
RF	17.1	20.4	17.6	16.0	9.2	15.4	16.5	10.4	15.9
GQ	0.1	1.8	3.9	2.5	0.6	0.7	1.0	4.1	1.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Migrants, Metro Origin	118	52	75	60	36	41	52	31	465
City	50.8%	32.7%	42.7%	58.3%	58.3%	56.1%	46.2%	45.2%	48.6%
RNF	41.5	11.5	9.3	36.7	27.8	31.7	44.2	35.5	31.2
RF	6.8	0.0	1.3	3.3	11.1	9.8	3.8	16.1	4.7
GQ	0.9	55.8	46.7	1.7	2.8	2.4	5.8	3.2	15.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Migrants, Nonmetro Origin	75	56	61	48	22	28	45	24	359
City	57.3%	26.8%	47.5%	75.0%	63.6%	46.4%	48.9%	41.7%	50.7%
RNF	33.3	26.8	19.7	18.8	31.8	42.9	35.6	33.3	28.9
RF	8.0	5.4	3.3	4.2	4.6	10.7	6.6	0.0	5.7
GQ	1.4	41.0	29.5	2.0	0.0	0.0	8.9	25.0	14.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Totals	1210	563	341	271	221	524	1148	615	4893

1. See footnotes to Table 1.

(Continued on next page)

Table 2 (cont.)

Migration Status between 1965-70 and 1970 Residence	Females								
	5-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-44	45-64	65+	Total
Non-Migrants	964	452	193	184	179	492	1062	667	4193
City	52.3%	54.0%	59.6%	54.9%	50.3%	61.0%	59.8%	66.0%	57.9%
RNF	29.5	27.4	28.0	33.7	32.4	24.2	26.6	22.0	26.9
RF	18.2	16.6	9.8	10.9	17.3	14.2	12.3	5.7	13.3
GQ	0.1	2.0	2.6	0.5	0.0	0.6	1.3	6.3	1.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Migrants, Metro Origin	106	41	57	62	35	25	60	31	417
City	50.9%	34.1%	57.9%	56.5%	65.6%	68.0%	51.7%	54.8%	55.7%
RNF	42.5	9.8	22.8	37.1	28.6	28.0	26.7	12.9	32.4
RF	5.7	7.3	5.3	6.4	2.9	4.0	20.0	12.9	5.0
GQ	0.9	48.8	14.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	1.7	19.4	8.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Migrants, Nonmetro Origin	62	49	86	34	20	33	39	27	350
City	53.2%	38.8%	54.7%	58.8%	60.0%	54.6%	53.8%	37.0%	51.4%
RNF	35.5	26.5	20.9	38.2	35.0	33.3	30.8	26.0	29.4
RF	9.7	6.1	4.7	3.0	5.0	9.1	10.3	0.0	6.3
GQ	1.6	28.6	19.7	0.0	0.0	3.0	5.1	37.0	12.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Totals	1132	542	336	280	234	550	1161	725	4960

Table 3. Age Distribution in 1970 of Non-Migrants, Metro Migrants, and Nonmetro Migrants by Sex and Residence in 1970[1]

Migration Status between 1965-70 and 1970 Residence	Males									
	5-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-44	45-64	65+	Total	N
Non-Migrants										
City	24.8%	10.4	4.8	3.9	3.7	11.7	26.3	14.4	100.0	2186
RNF	25.4%	10.7	4.7	4.0	5.7	10.7	24.8	14.0	100.0	1179
RF	27.0%	14.4	5.6	4.0	2.3	10.9	26.8	9.0	100.0	645
GQ	1.7%	13.6	13.6	6.8	1.7	5.1	18.6	39.0	100.0	59
Total	25.0%	11.2	5.0	4.0	4.0	11.2	25.8	13.8	100.0	4069
Migrants, Metro Origin										
City	26.5%	7.5	14.2	15.5	9.3	10.2	10.6	6.2	100.0	226
RNF	33.8%	4.1	4.8	15.2	6.9	8.9	15.9	10.3	100.0	145
RF	36.4%	0.0	4.5	9.1	18.2	18.2	9.1	4.5	100.0	22
GQ	1.4%	40.3	48.6	1.4	1.4	1.4	4.2	1.4	100.0	72
Total	25.4%	11.2	16.1	12.9	7.7	8.8	11.2	6.7	100.0	465
Migrants, Nonmetro Origin										
City	23.6%	8.2	15.9	19.8	7.7	7.1	12.1	5.5	100.0	180
RNF	24.0%	14.4	11.5	8.7	6.7	11.5	15.4	7.7	100.0	104
RF	30.0%	15.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	15.0	15.0	0.0	100.0	20
GQ	1.9%	43.4	33.9	1.9	0.0	0.0	7.5	11.3	100.0	53
Total	20.9%	15.6	16.9	13.4	6.1	7.8	12.5	6.7	100.0	357

1. See footnotes to Table 1.

(Continued on next page)

Table 3 (cont.)

Migration Status between 1965-70 and 1970 Residence	Females									
	5-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-44	45-64	65+	Total	N
Non-Migrants										
City	20.7%	10.0	4.7	4.2	3.7	12.4	26.1	18.1	100.0	2429
RNF	25.1%	11.0	4.8	5.5	5.1	10.5	25.0	13.0	100.0	1130
RF	31.3%	13.4	3.4	3.6	5.5	12.5	23.4	6.8	100.0	559
GQ	1.3%	12.0	6.7	1.3	0.0	4.0	18.7	56.0	100.0	75
Total	23.0%	10.8	4.6	4.4	4.3	11.7	25.3	15.9	100.0	4193
Migrants, Metro Origin										
City	24.1%	6.3	14.7	15.6	10.3	7.6	13.8	7.6	100.0	224
RNF	33.3%	3.0	9.6	17.0	7.4	5.2	18.5	5.9	100.0	135
RF	28.6%	14.3	14.3	19.0	4.8	4.8	14.3	0.0	100.0	21
GQ	2.7%	54.1	21.6	0.0	2.7	0.0	2.7	16.2	100.0	37
Total	25.4%	9.8	13.7	14.9	8.4	5.9	14.4	7.4	100.0	417
Migrants, Nonmetro Origin										
City	18.3%	10.6	26.1	11.1	6.7	10.0	11.7	5.6	100.0	182
RNF	21.4%	12.6	17.5	12.6	6.8	10.7	11.7	6.8	100.0	103
RF	27.3	13.6	18.2	4.5	4.5	13.6	18.2	0.0	100.0	22
GQ	2.2	31.1	37.8	0.0	0.0	2.2	4.4	22.2	100.0	45
Total	17.7	14.0	24.6	9.7	5.7	9.4	11.1	7.7	100.0	352

Table 4. Selected Characteristics of White Household Heads by Migration Status Between 1965-70 and Location of Residence in 1970.

Characteristic	Non-Migrants			Migrants, Metro Origin			Migrants, Non-Metro Origin		
	City or Suburb	Rural Non-Farm	Rural Farm	City or Surbur	Rural Non-Farm	Rural Farm	City or Suburb	Rural Non-Farm	Rural Farm
Percent working	60.4	63.2	81.8	68.0	65.6	100.0	70.8	64.2	90.0
Percent blue collar workers (%)	75.1	84.5	94.9	57.5	76.7	72.7	58.5	71.6	80.0
Percent receiving retirement income (%)	33.2	29.3	18.8	11.8	22.2	--	12.3	14.9	--
Percent receiving welfare income (%)	3.1	3.1	1.0	3.3	--	--	2.3	4.5	--
Percent married with spouse present (%)	67.9	74.2	85.0	71.2	84.4	100.0	73.1	77.6	90.0
Percent in school in 1965 (%)	1.7	.8	--	13.1	6.7	9.1	13.8	10.4	--
Median years of school completed (yrs.)	12.9	11.0	10.2	14.3	13.5	14.0	14.4	13.9	13.7
Median age (yrs.)	55.3	53.3	51.6	32.6	39.5	32.0	29.5	37.8	39.5
Median income ($)	5738	5062	5041	6950	5992	8800	6021	5038	8000
Median household size	2.4	2.5	3.7	3.1	3.2	4.8	3.1	2.9	4.8
N	1675	768	314	153	90	11	130	67	10

Table 5. Percent of 1970 Residents Who Lived in a Different County in 1965 by Location of Residence in 1970, Sex, and Age in 1970[1]

Location of Residence in 1970	5-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-44	45-64	65+	Total	N
					- Males -					
City	15.9	12.4	36.7	45.2	30.4	12.3	7.4	7.1	15.7	2594
Rural Non-Farm (RNF)	19.8	14.2	25.3	39.7	20.2	16.6	11.8	12.2	17.4	1428
Rural Farm (RF)	7.4	3.1	10.0	16.1	25.0	9.1	2.8	1.7	6.1	687
Group Quarters (GQ)	66.7	86.7	86.9	33.3	50.0	25.0	38.9	23.3	67.9	184
Total	16.0	19.2	39.9	39.9	26.2	13.2	8.5	8.9	16.8	4893
Number of 1965-70 Migrants	193	108	136	108	58	69	97	55	824	
Number of Residents in 1970	1210	563	341	271	221	524	1148	615	4893	
					- Females -					
City	14.7	11.9	41.0	35.3	28.0	10.4	7.6	5.8	14.3	2833
Rural Non-Farm (RNF)	19.1	12.1	34.9	36.7	22.7	13.1	11.6	9.3	17.8	1368
Rural Farm (RF)	6.4	7.4	32.1	20.0	6.1	5.4	5.1	0.0	7.1	602
Group Quarters (GQ)	66.7	79.1	83.3	0.0	100.0	25.0	17.6	27.6	52.2	157
Total	14.8	16.6	42.6	34.3	23.5	10.5	8.5	8.0	15.5	4960
Number of 1965-70 Migrants	168	90	143	96	55	58	99	58	767	
Number of Residents in 1970	1132	542	336	280	234	550	1161	725	4960	

Table A-1 Counties in Study

Counties	Population 1960	Population 1970	Population 1975	Change 1960-70	Change 1970-75
Michigan:					
Alger	9,250	8,568	8,800	-682	232
Baraga	7,151	7,789	8,000	638	211
Delta	34,298	35,924	39,500	1,626	3,576
Dickinson	23,917	23,753	25,100	-164	1,347
Gogebic	24,370	20,676	20,700	-3,694	24
Houghton	35,654	34,652	36,700	-1,002	2,048
Iron	17,184	13,813	14,300	-3,371	487
Keweenaw	2,417	2,264	2,100	-153	-164
Marquette	56,154	64,686	70,300	8,532	5,614
Menominee	24,685	24,587	25,500	-98	913
Ontonagon	10,584	10,548	11,300	-36	752
Schoolcraft	8,953	8,226	8,600	-727	374
Wisconsin:					
Ashland	17,375	16,743	16,700	-632	-43
Barron	34,270	33,955	37,500	-315	3,545
Bayfield	11,910	11,683	12,400	-227	717
Chippewa	45,096	47,717	49,600	2,621	1,883
Clark	31,527	30,361	32,100	1,166	1,739
Dunn	26,156	29,154	32,000	2,998	2,846
Eau Claire	58,300	67,219	72,500	8,919	5,281
Florence	3,437	3,298	3,500	-139	202
Forest	7,541	7,691	8,700	149	1,009
Iron	7,830	6,533	6,500	-1,297	-33
Landglade	19,916	19,220	19,800	-696	580
Lincoln	22,338	23,499	25,300	1,161	1,801
Marathon	88,874	97,457	104,800	8,583	7,543
Marinette	34,660	35,810	37,100	1,150	1,290
Ocoshaw[1]	59,461	60,810	64,100	1,349	3,390
Oneida	22,112	24,427	28,400	2,315	3,973
Pepin	7,332	7,319	7,600	-13	281
Portage	36,964	47,541	52,800	10,577	5,259
Price	14,370	14,520	25,600	150	1,080
Rusk	14,794	14,238	15,200	-556	962
Sawyer	9,475	9,670	11,600	195	1,930
Taylor	17,843	16,958	18,300	-885	1,342
Vilas	9,332	10,958	13,400	1,626	2,442
Washburn	10,301	10,601	12,300	300	1,699
Waupaca	35,340	37,780	41,100	2,440	3,320
Wood	59,105	65,362	67,900	6,257	2,538
Minnesota:					
Carlton	27,932	28,072	28,500	140	428
Cook	3,377	3,423	3,600	46	177
Itasca	38,006	35,530	37,600	-2,476	2,070
Koochiching	18,190	17,131	17,500	-1,059	369
Lake	13,702	13,351	14,200	-351	849
Total	1,061,484	1,103,517	1,179,200	42,033	75,683
Percentage Change		1960-70: 4.0%	1970-75: 6.9%		

1. Data are combined for Oconto, Shawano, and Menominee Counties. The Menominee Indian Reservation, once part of Oconto and Shawano Counties, was organized into a county unit in 1961.

Figure A-1 Counties in Study